



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/683,532	01/16/2002	Victoria M.E. Bellotti	110143	7732
27074	7590	03/26/2008	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC. P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850			CHOWDHURY, AZIZUL Q	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2145				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/26/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

OfficeAction27074@oliff.com
jarmstrong@oliff.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 09/683,532 Examiner AZIZUL CHOUDHURY	Applicant(s) BELLOTTI ET AL. Art Unit 2145
---	---	---

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 18 January 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires ____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) ____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant failed to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet

12. Note the attached *Information Disclosure Statement(s)*. (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.

13. Other: _____.

/Jason D Cardone/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2145

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments presented are not deemed fully persuasive. The first point of contention addressed by the applicant concerns the claimed feature of a user gaining access to a secured area of a site after clicking on a link that can be received through an email. More specifically, the applicant contends that since the examiner states that Kim does not teach the feature that the Kim prior art cannot be combined with the Rienhoff prior art. In addition, the applicant contends that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. The examiner strongly disagrees with these assertions. The Rienhoff art was added to teach a feature that the Kim prior art was silent about. Rienhoff teaches how a user gains access to a secured section of a website (equivalent to the claimed access to the associated process of the workflow system) after clicking on a link that can be received through an email (equivalent to the claimed link); see paragraph 112, Rienhoff. The combining of arts is permitted within a 103-type rejection. In addition, the motivation applied to combine the two references is appropriate.

The second point of contention addressed by the applicant continues to concern Rienhoff's design allowing users access to secure content. The applicant contends that users are only permitted access after logging in with a name and password. The examiner disagrees. The login that the applicant refers to is related to the general registration with a site. This is equivalent to a person being entered into a company's email database after getting hired by the company. The asserted login does not have to occur when accessing the secured area. The user can gain access to secure content within a webpage through a link as claimed. Even at that point, a secondary login setup is available but is completely optional. This is evident by the use of the language, "in some embodiments, the user may be given, or requested to establish, an additional login name and/or password to permit them access to the secured area" (see paragraph 112, Rienhoff). Hence, access to a secure area of a site does not require login as asserted but is rather accessible via a link as claimed.

The third point of contention addressed by the applicant concerns claims 4-5, and 13-14. The applicant contends that the Kim art does not teach the randomly or pseudo-randomly generating of network addresses. The examiner disagrees with this assertion. Kim teaches this trait in p. 2, 2nd column, lines 25-43 and p. 3, 1st column, lines 2-4.

The fourth point of contention involves the concept of embedding more than one link within an email. The applicant contends that Kim does not teach such a feature and the presence of such a feature would alter Kim's method of operation. While Kim does not teach such a feature, it is well known in the art and Official Notice is being taken by the examiner to state that the concept of embedding a plurality of links within an email is well known in the art. No alteration in methods of operation is required for embedding multiple links versus one link, within an email. If means are present by which to embed a single link within an email, it is extremely well known within the art that those exact same means can be used to embed multiple links within an email.

The final point of contention involves the trait of "excluding generating network addresses that have been embedded in previous emails but have not been accessed." The applicant contends that Kim does not teach such a feature; the examiner disagrees. Kim teaches in the second column of page 2, within lines 25-40, that the data within the email (including the URL) can be encrypted to prevent it from being exposed. Hence, the URL within each email is unique.

/AC/